

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in response to the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

***Claims 1, 11, 13, 22, 27-35, and 40-55:***

Claims 1, 11, 13, 22, 27-35, and 40-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,862,4040, hereinafter Onaga and U.S. Patent No. 5,435,544, hereinafter Mandel. The Examiner appears to rely on Onaga for all claim elements, except for the feature of “each of the computers receives the status of the printers without sending a status request”. For this feature, the Examiner relies upon Mandel.

Claim 1 defines a print system, claims 11, 29, and 33 each defines a method of controlling a print system, and claim 22 defines a print server adapted to be connected to a plurality of printers and a plurality of computers. Claims 27 and 31 each defines a print server to which at least one printer and a plurality of computers are connected to the print server. And, claim 35 defines a print server that includes a job observer for monitoring status information of a plurality of printers and a sender for sending the status information to the plurality of computers simultaneously. Furthermore, a feature of each of claims 1, 11, 22, and 35 is that the status of a plurality of printers is gathered or monitored and sent to a plurality of computers *simultaneously and without any of the computers sending a status request*. A feature of each of claims 27, 29, 31, and 33 is that the status of at least one printer

is monitored and sent to a plurality of computers *simultaneously* and *without any of the computers sending a status request*.

In the rejection, the Examiner refers to column 4, lines 41-42, 55-58, and 60-65, and column 6, lines 29-33, as evidence that Onaga teaches, among other elements, a file server that provides all of the status of the peripheral devices simultaneously to the plurality of work stations. On page 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Onaga teaches the “simultaneous” feature because the status information is stored in a central location from which all workstations obtain it. However, Applicant submits that the recited section of Onaga do not teach or suggest that the status information of a plurality of peripheral devices is simultaneously sent or notified to a plurality of work stations. The fact that all of the workstations may obtain the information is quite different than actually *sending* or *notifying* the plurality of computers simultaneously.

Applicant submits that the system disclosed in Onaga does not teach *sending* or *notifying* the status of each of the peripheral devices 110 to each of the workstations 150 simultaneously. In fact, from a review of Figures 2, 3A, and 3B of Onaga, it is clear that the process of sending the device status information from the file server 120 to a particular workstation 150 is initiated by a workstation 150 requesting device status information. There is no teaching or suggestion in Onaga that each of the workstations can or should request a status file simultaneously.

In view of the fact that, in the teachings of Onaga, the status information is only sent from the file server to the workstation if the workstation 150 requests the

device status information, there is no teaching or suggestion of sending status information simultaneously to a plurality of computers. Specifically, *Onaga* only sends the status information to a particular computer when requested by the particular computer.

Furthermore, each of the independent claims of the present application specifically states that the status information is sent out without any of the plurality of computers sending a status request. For this feature, the Examiner relies upon Mandel. However, Mandel teaches that the status of a print job is sent to a particular computer that originated the print job in order to advise that particular computer when the print job is completed or if the printer is out of paper. The Examiner relies upon Fig. 22 and col. 1, lines 40-46, to allegedly teach that the print server automatically generates a network message to the users without receiving a status request from the users. However, this portion of Mandel refers to sending a report back to a specific computer that initiated a job request. It does not teach or suggest sending a status report to a plurality of computers without any of the computers sending a status request. If the Examiner is relying upon any other sections of Mandel, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically identify such sections for the Applicants.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither *Onaga*, nor Mandel, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests the combinations set forth in claims 1, 11, 13, 22, 27-35, and 40-55, and in particular, combinations that include

the “*simultaneously*” feature of the present claims and the “*without any of the computers sending a status request*” feature of the present claims.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 11, 13, 22, 27-35, and 40-55.

***Claim 4 and 14:***

Claims 4 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga, Mandel, and U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135, hereinafter Webb. Claims 4 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively. The Examiner relies upon Webb for its alleged teaching of providing an optional object displayed in the window including the object for postponing a particular print job by user. Such teachings do not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of claims 1 and 11 based on Onaga and Mandel. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 4 and 14 should be withdrawn.

***Claims 6 and 15-16:***

Claims 6 and 15-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onaga, Mandel, and U.S. Patent No. 5,669,040, hereinafter Hisatake.

The Examiner relies upon Hisatake for its alleged teaching of the status monitor of each of the plurality of computers including means for displaying an

operating condition in which a waiting time for the printer that is displayed in the status monitor. The teaching in Hisatake relied upon by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of claims 1 and 11, from which claims 6 and 15-16 depend. Accordingly, claims 6 and 15-16 are patentable over the combination of Onaga, Mandel, and Hisatake.

***Claims 17-19:***

Claims 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onaga, Mandel, and U.S. Patent No. 6,213,652, hereinafter Suzuki. The Examiner alleges that Suzuki teaches that the computers and the print server exchange registration request and response information. However, such teachings do not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of claim 11 based on Onaga and Mandel. Accordingly, claims 17-19 are also patentable over the combination of Onaga, Mandel, and Suzuki.

***Claims 10, 21, and 23:***

Claims 10, 21, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga and Mandel, as applied to claims 1, 11, and 22, and JP Patent No. 409212313A, hereinafter JP '313. Claims 10, 21, and 23 depend from claims 1, 11, and 22, respectively. The Examiner relies upon JP '313 for its alleged teaching of the print server including means for calculating a waiting time for availability of a printer. However, this teaching does not overcome the

deficiency of the rejection of claims 1, 11, and 22, based on Onaga and Mandel.

Accordingly, claims 10, 21, and 23 are also patentable over the applied prior art.

The Office Action sets forth additional analyses concerning the alleged teachings of the cited prior art. At the present time, Applicant does not take a position concerning such other analyses, and reserves the right to challenge such analyses at a later time, if necessary and appropriate. The Applicants also reserve the right to challenge the alleged motivation for combining Onaga with Mandel and for combining Onaga and Mandel with the other secondary references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 21, 2004

By: William C Rowland  
William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620